

Appl. No. 10/809,357  
Amendment dated: March 11, 2005  
Reply to OA of: December 15, 2004

### **REMARKS**

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claim 1 by incorporating the limitations from allowable claim 2 therein placing claim 1 in immediate condition for allowance. Dependent claims 10-13 to further specific aspects of the invention as fully supported by pages 3 and 4 of Applicants' specification have been added. Since these claims are dependent on allowable independent claim 1, these claims also are allowable. Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on allowable amended claim 1 thereby making claims 3 and 4 allowable also.

Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer as being redundant. Claims 5-9 have been canceled from the application without prejudice or disclaimer as being directed to a nonelected invention and Applicants reserve all rights to file a divisional application to the nonelected invention. Please note that claim 9 was included in the original restriction requirement and was still present in the application. The indication in the Official Action that the application contains claims 1-8 appears to be an error of no consequence. Applicants most respectfully submit that all the claims now present in the application are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 and are clearly patentable over the references of record.

The rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Helton et al. has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed.

Applicant wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2131 which states that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*,

Appl. No. 10/809,357  
Amendment dated: March 11, 2005  
Reply to OA of: December 15, 2004

868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

*Akzo N.V. v. International Trade Comm'n*, 808 F.2d 1471, 1 USPQ2d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (Claims to a process for making aramid fibers using a 98% solution of sulfuric acid were not anticipated by a reference which disclosed using sulfuric acid solution but which did not disclose using a 98% concentrated sulfuric acid solution.).

Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the amendment to the claims.

The rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Helton et al. in view of Paskell has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed.

Applicants wish to direct the Examiner's attention to the basic requirements of a prima facie case of obviousness as set forth in the MPEP § 2143. This section states that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria first must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Section 2143.03 states that all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an

Appl. No. 10/809,357  
Amendment dated: March 11, 2005  
Reply to OA of: December 15, 2004

independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicants also most respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2144.08 (page 2100-114) wherein it is stated that Office personnel should consider all rebuttal argument and evidence present by applicant and the citation of In re Soni for error in not considering evidence presented in the specification.

Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the amendment to the claims.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By:   
Richard E. Fichter  
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, 4<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

REF:kdd  
A01.wpd

March 11, 2005